



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

remove it is a "contract for the sale of real estate" within the statute of frauds, and must be in writing.

While there is probably no conflict on this point in the case of such a contract as that in the leading case, there is a sharp conflict as to the applicability of the statute of frauds to such contracts, when they are to be performed immediately. Many cases hold that any contract for the sale of standing timber is within the statute of frauds. *Cool v. Peters, Etc., Co.*, 87 Ind., 531; *Green v. Armstrong*, 1 Denio, 550; *McGregor v. Brown*, 10 N. Y., 114; *Lillie v. Dunbar*, 62 Wis., 198; *Garner v. Mahoney*, 115 Ia., 356; *Harrell v. Miller*, 35 Miss., 700; *Slocum v. Seymour*, 36 N. J. Law, 138. On the other hand, many cases hold that where the contract contemplates the immediate separation of the trees from the land, it is not within the statute. *In re Benjamin*, 140 Fed., 320; *Leonard v. Medford*, 85 Md., 666; *Banton v. Sherry*, 77 Me., 48; *Byasee v. Reese*, 4 Met., (Ky.), 372; *Clafin v. Carpenter*, 4 Metc., 580; *Robbins v. Farwell*, 193 Pa. St., 37. And this appears to be the English rule, *Marshall v. Green*, 1 C. P. Div., 35. In *Wilson v. Fuller*, 58 Minn., 149, it is held that though such a contract may have been originally within the statute, the cutting of the trees takes it out of the statute. In *Killmore v. Howlett*, 48 N. Y., 569, a distinction is drawn between a contract for the sale of standing timber, and a contract whereby the owner was to cut the trees and deliver them as cord-wood; and the latter is held to be a contract for work and labor and for the sale of chattels.

INSURANCE—EMPLOYER'S ACCIDENT INSURANCE—PERSONS ENTITLED TO SUE.—*CLARK v. BONSALE & Co.*, 72 S. W., 954 (N. C.).—*Held*, that unless an employer's accident insurance policy expressly provides that it is for the benefit of injured employes, and that amounts recovered should be paid to them, an injured employe may not, in the first instance, sue on the policy.

The injured employe is no party to the contract, nor has he any rights, legal or equitable, growing out of it. *Finley v. U. S. Casualty Co.*, 113 Tenn., 592; *Frye v. Bath Gas & Electric Co.*, 97 Me., 241. If the policy amounts to a contract of indemnity, an action cannot be maintained against the insurance company, on the theory that the amount is not due until the insured has paid the loss. *Allen v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.*, 76 C. C. A., 265; *Connelly v. Bolster*, 187 Mass., 266. Though such an action was allowed in *Sanders v. Frankfort Ins. Co.*, 72 N. H., 485. Where the policy insures directly against liability, some courts hold the view that the insurer is liable to garnishment. *Hoven v. Employer's Liability Co.*, 93 Wis., 201; *Fritchie v. Miller's Extract Co.*, 197 Pa., 401. That the insurance money due under a policy against liability to third persons does not constitute a trust fund for the benefit of the person whose injury caused the liability was expressly decided in *Bain v. Atkins*, 181 Mass., 240. By statute in New York State, contracts making the insurer directly liable to the injured employe, are expressly authorized. St. 1892, C. 690, §55.

INSURANCE—INSURABLE INTEREST—ASSIGNMENT OF POLICY INTEREST.—*JOHNSON v. MUT. BEN. LIFE INS. CO.*, 72 S. E., 847 (N. C.).—*Held*, that an